



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/674,738	09/30/2003	Tony T. Quach	66329/31274	6724
23380 7590 01/08/2008 TUCKER ELLIS & WEST LLP 1150 HUNTINGTON BUILDING 925 EUCLID AVENUE CLEVELAND, OH 44115-1414			EXAMINER HANG, VU B	
			ART UNIT 2625	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 01/08/2008	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patents@tuckerellis.com
mary.erne@tuckerellis.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/674,738

Applicant(s)

QUACH ET AL.

Examiner

Vu B. Hang

Art Unit

2625

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 October 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-5,13-16,18-20 and 28-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-5,13-16,18-20 and 28-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 30 September 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>09/30/2003</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

- This office action is responsive to the communication filed on 10/16/2007.
- The amendments received on 10/16/2007 have been entered and made of record.
- Claims 2, 6-12, 17, 21-27 and 31-38 have been cancelled.
- Claims 1, 3-5, 13-16, 18-20 and 28-30 are pending in the application.

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 10/16/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The newly added claim limitations "receiving a document imaging request associated with the received electronic document; isolating font specification data associated with the received electronic documents; testing isolated font specification data in accordance with the font file data stored in the associated data storage; retrieving a font data file from the associated storage in accordance with the step of testing; and rendering the electronic documents in conjunction with the retrieved font data file", found in Claims 1, 13, 16 and 28, are not specified in the applicant's specification. Claims 1, 13, 16 and 28 are being rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3. **Claims 1, 13, 16 and 28** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Information relating to claim limitations "receiving a document imaging request associated with the received electronic document; isolating font specification data associated with the received electronic documents; testing isolated font specification data in accordance with the font file data stored in the associated data storage; retrieving a font data file from the associated storage in accordance with the step of testing; and rendering the electronic documents in conjunction with the retrieved font data file", found in Claims 1, 13, 16 and 28, are not specified in the applicant's specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. --Claims 1, 3-5, 16 and 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Collins et al. (US Patent 5,781,714) in view of Patel et al. (US Patent 6,426,751 B1).

6. Regarding **Claims 1 and 16**, Collins discloses a method to manage multiple format fonts in an image-generating device (see Fig.22, Col.5, Line 23-28 and Col.5, Line 58-63), comprising the steps of: receiving a management request from an associated user to store a font in a selected

storages area of the image generating device (see Col.9, Line 32-40, Col.9, Line 65-67, Col.26, Line 43-50 and Col.27, Line 27-29); receiving font data corresponding to a received management request (see Col.9, Line 32-40, Col.9, Line 65-67, Col.26, Line 43-50 and Col.27, Line 27-29); determining, from the received font data, the type of font to be stored (see Col.13, Line 26-31); selectively generating a new font file (see Col.9, Line 16-40); and receiving an electronic document for displaying and printing (see Fig.1 (102,104,108,112) and Col.8, Line 56-62). Collins fails to expressly disclose selectively generating the font file such that when the font to be stored is of specific font, pre-appending a selected language code to the specific font data to create a new font file inclusive of a language code portion and a font data portion containing the received font data in its native form; and converting font data that is determined to be atypical, into a suitable format for processing.

7. Collins, however, teaches that not all computer devices have the same font description or the ability to interpret the same font languages (see Col.3, Line 4-20), and teaches the need for consistency in interpreting the font languages when rendering the font description data between two different devices (see Col.10, Line 5-14). Collins further teaches that there exist different font description languages, including Postscript and TrueType, that use their own code/format and interpreters to describe the fonts (see Col.2, Line 51-63 and see Col.10, Line 15-26). Collins also teaches generating new font description files that are portable and independent in format, based on predefined description of the font files (see Col.9, Line 16-41). Patel teaches creating a font file that defines changes to an existing font file, wherein the font file can be processed in combination with an existing font file to establish an enhanced font file (see Col.1, Line 44-54 and Col.3, Line 10-21).

8. Collins and Patel are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely font processing systems. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art to selectively generate the new font files such that when the font to be stored is a specific font format, converting and/or pre-appending selected language code to create a new font file. The motivation would be to ensure the consistency of the interpretation font description data, regardless of the description language or format used. The construction of portable and independent font files would enable complete and consistent interpretation of font data between two different computers that uses different font description languages and interpreters.

9. Regarding **Claims 3 and 18**, Collins further discloses the processed file in the selected storage area (see Col.9, Line 32-40 and Col.9, Line 65-67).

10. Regarding **Claims 4 and 19**, Collins and Patel teach the method of Claim 1 but fail to expressly disclose receiving the management request from an associated user over the network via simple network management protocol or web administration user interface. Collins, however, discloses the management request is received from an associated user over the network, including LAN's and WAN's (see Fig.22, Col.9, Line 50-54, Col.26, Line 43-50 and Col.27, Line 27-29). At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to receive the management request from an associated user over the network via simple network management protocol or web administration user interface. The motivation would be to control the data traffic between computers in a network environment, such as LAN or WAN.

11. Regarding **Claims 5 and 20**, Collins and Patel teach the method of Claim 1 but fail to expressly disclose the image generating device is selected from a group consisting of a facsimile device and a copying device. Collins, however, discloses the image-generating device is selected

from a group consisting of a video display device and a printer (see Fig.1 (112), Fig.22 (614) and Col.9, Line 65 – Col.10, Line 4). At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to include to the group of selection a facsimile machine and a copying device, as they are image-forming devices. The motivation would be to give the user multiple image-forming devices to select from for image data communication, depending on the user's need and preferences. It is known in the art that multifunction peripheral devices include a copying device, a facsimile device and a print device, from which a user can select.

12. Claims 13-15 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Collins et al. (US Patent 5,781,714) in view of Patel et al. (US Patent 6,426,751 B1), and in further view of McQueen et al. (US Patent 5,586,242).

13. Regarding **Claims 13 and 28**, Collins discloses a method to manage multiple format fonts in an image-generating device (see Fig.22, Col.5, Line 23-28 and Col.5, Line 58-63), comprising the steps of: receiving a management request from an associated user to store a font in a selected storages area of the image generating device (see Col.9, Line 32-40, Col.9, Line 65-67, Col.26, Line 43-50 and Col.27, Line 27-29); receiving font data corresponding to a received management request (see Col.9, Line 32-40, Col.9, Line 65-67, Col.26, Line 43-50 and Col.27, Line 27-29); determining, from the received font data, the type of font to be stored (see Col.13, Line 26-31); selectively generating a new font file (see Col.9, Line 16-40); and receiving an electronic document for displaying and printing (see Fig.1 (102,104,108,112) and Col.8, Line 56-62). Collins fails to disclose selectively generating the new font files such that when the font to be stored is a specific font format, converting and/or pre-appending selected language code to create a new font file inclusive of a language code portion and a font data portion containing the

received font data in its native form; receiving a management request from an associated user to remove a selected font from a storage area, creating a new file that includes a selected command and the font to be removed, and upon determination that the selected font is stored in the storage area, removing the selected font from the storage area; and generating a list of fonts corresponding to the selected type of font; and transmitting the list of fonts to the associated user via the display means and generating test documents listing the fonts.

14. Collins, however, teaches that not all computer devices have the same font description or the ability to interpret the same font languages (see Col.3, Line 4-20), and teaches the need for consistency in interpreting the font languages when rendering the font description data between two different devices (see Col.10, Line 5-14). Collins further teaches that there exist different font description languages, including Postscript and TrueType, that use their own code/format and interpreters to describe the fonts (see Col.2, Line 51-63 and see Col.10, Line 15-26). Collins also teaches generating new font description files that are portable and independent in format, based on predefined description of the font files (see Col.9, Line 16-41). Patel teaches creating a font file that defines changes to an existing font file, wherein the font file can be processed in combination with an existing font file to establish an enhanced font file (see Col.1, Line 44-54 and Col.3, Line 10-21).

15. McQueen discloses receiving a management request from an associated user to remove a selected font from a storage area (see Fig.7 (130) and Col.9, Line 1-14); creating a new file that includes a selected command and the font to be removed (see Col.9, Line 1-14); and removing the selected font from the storage area (see Fig.7 (138) and Col.9, Line 15-23). McQueen further teaches the problem of dealing with too many fonts and deinstalling them is tedious and time-

consuming (see Col.9, line 45-55). McQueen also discloses generating a list of fonts corresponding to the selected type of font (see Fig.9, Col.4, Line 57-60 and Col.9, Line 1-27); and transmitting the list of fonts to the associated user via the display means (see Fig.9 and Col.4, Line 57-60); and generating test documents listing the fonts (see Fig.9 and Col.10, Line 40-65).

16. Collins, Patel and McQueen are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely systems for managing format fonts. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art to selectively generate the new font files such that when the font to be stored is a specific font format, converting and/or pre-appending selected language code to create a new font file. The motivation would be to ensure the consistency of the interpretation font description data, regardless of the description language or format used. The construction of portable and independent font files would enable complete and consistent interpretation of font data between two different computers that uses different font description languages and interpreters.

17. It is further obvious to include to Collins method the steps of receiving a management request from an associated user to remove a selected font from a storage area; creating a new file that includes a selected command and the font to be removed; and upon determination that the selected font is stored in the storage area, removing the selected font from the storage area. The motivation would be to remove excess fonts that are not needed and avoid the time-consuming process of deinstalling the fonts. Creating a file with the fonts to be removed would allow for a user to avoid the process of deinstalling the fonts.

18. It is also obvious to include to Collins method the steps of generating a list of fonts corresponding to the selected type of font; and transmitting the list of fonts to the associated user via the display means; and generating test documents listing the fonts. The motivation would be to provide a user interface for creating and displaying the font lists. The user interface would allow for the selected font description data to be viewed on the display and then be used on the intended documents.

19. Regarding **Claims 14 and 29**, Collins and Patel teach the method of Claim 13 but fail to expressly disclose receiving the management request from an associated user over the network via simple network management protocol or web administration user interface. Collins, however, discloses the management request is received from an associated user over the network, including LAN's and WAN's (see Fig.22, Col.9, Line 50-54, Col.26, Line 43-50 and Col.27, Line 27-29). At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to receive the management request from an associated user over the network via simple network management protocol or a web administration user interface. The motivation would be to control the data traffic between computers in a network environment, such as LAN or WAN.

20. Regarding **Claims 15 and 30**, Collins and Patel teach the method of Claim 13 but fail to expressly disclose the image generating device is selected from a group consisting of a facsimile device and a copying device. Collins, however, discloses the image-generating device is selected from a group consisting of a video display device or a printer (see Fig.1 (112), Fig.22 (614) and Col.9, Line 65 – Col.10, Line 4). At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to include to the group of selection a facsimile machine and a copying device, as they are image-forming devices. The motivation would be to give the user multiple image-forming devices to

select from for image data communication, depending on the user's need and preferences. It is known in the art that multifunction peripheral devices include a copying device, a facsimile device and a print device, from which a user can select.

Conclusion

21. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

22. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

23. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Vu B. Hang whose telephone number is (571) 272-0582. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 9:00am - 6:00pm.


24. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Twyler L. Lamb can be reached on (571) 272-7406. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number:
10/674,738
Art Unit: 2625

Page 11

25. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Vu Hang
Assistant Examiner



TWYLER LAMB HASKINS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER